

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROSEANNE SAKAMOTO,

No. C 03-5499 SI

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR AMENDMENT OF
JUDGMENT ON RETALIATION AND
DISCRIMINATION; DENYING AS
MOOT DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR
JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW**

STEPHEN JOHNSON, Administrator, U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency,

Defendant.

The Court has received plaintiff's "motion for amendment of judgment on retaliation and discrimination."¹ Plaintiff seeks to "reopen" the jury's verdict against her on the retaliation claims. Specifically, plaintiff requests that the Court recall the jury to question them about their verdict because she contends the verdict form was confusing. Plaintiff also wishes to put on additional evidence in support of her claims.

The Court DENIES plaintiff's motion. The Court finds that the special verdict form and jury instructions properly instructed the jury regarding plaintiff's retaliation claim. The Court also notes that plaintiff did not object to the verdict form or the jury instructions. Plaintiff's request to reopen the trial to put on additional evidence is frivolous.

In light of the jury's verdict in favor of defendant, defendant's motion for judgment as a matter of law (Docket No. 456) and any pending in-trial motions are DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 15, 2007



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

¹ Plaintiff faxed the motion to chambers. If she has not already done so, plaintiff is directed to file a copy of the motion with the Clerk.